arXiv:math/9807183v1 [math.LO] 15 Jul 1998

STRONG DICHOTOMY OF CARDINALITY
SH664

Saharon Shelah

Institute of Mathematics
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel

Rutgers University
Mathematics Department
New Brunswick, NJ USA

Research supported by the German-Israeli Foundation for Scientific Research
I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.
Written Spring '97
First Typed - 97/Sept/2
Latest Revision - 98/July/28

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$-TEX

Anotated Content

§0 Introduction

§1 Countable Groups

[We present a result on ω analytic equivalence relations on $\mathscr{P}(\omega)$ and apply it to $\aleph_0$-system of groups, sharpening somewhat [GrSh 302a].]

§2 On λ-analytic equivalence relations

[We generalize §1 replacing $\aleph_0$ by λ regular, unfortunately this is only consistent.]

§3 On λ-systems of groups

[This relates to §2 as the application relates to the lemma in §1.]

§4 Back to the p-rank of Ext

[We show that we can put the problem in the title to the previous context, and show that in Easton model, §2 and §3 apply to every regular λ.]

§5 Strong limit of countable cofinality

[We continue [GrSh 302a].]

§0

A usual dichotomy is that in many cases, reasonably definable sets, satisfies the CH, i.e. if they are uncountable they have cardinality continuum. A strong dichotomy is when: if the cardinality is infinite it is continuum as in [Sh 273]. We are interested in such phenomena when $\lambda = \aleph_0$ is replaced by λ regular uncountable and also by $\lambda = \beth_\omega$ or more generally by strong limit of cofinality $\aleph_0$.

Question: Dom the parallel of 1.2 holds for e.g. $\beth_\omega$? portion?

§1 Countable groups

Here we give a complete proof a strengthening of the theorem of [GrSh 302a], for the case $\lambda = \aleph_0$ using a variant of [Sh 273].

1.1 Theorem. *Suppose*

- (A) *λ is $\aleph_0$. Let $\langle G_m, \pi_{m,n} : m \le n < \omega\rangle$ be an inverse system whose inverse limit is G_ω with $\pi_{n,\omega}$ such that $|G_n| < \lambda$. (So $\pi_{m,n}$ is a homomorphism from G_n to $G_m, \alpha \le \beta \le \gamma \le \omega \Rightarrow \pi_{\alpha,\beta} \circ \pi_{\beta,\gamma} = \pi_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $\Pi_{\alpha,\alpha}$ is the identity).*
- (B) *Let $\mathbf{I}$ be an index set. For every $t \in \mathbf{I}$, let $\langle H^t_m, \pi^t_{m,n} : m \le n < \omega\rangle$ be an inverse system of groups and H^t_ω with $\pi^t_{n,\omega}$ be the corresponding inverse limit and H^t_m of cardinality $< \lambda$.*
- (C) *Let for every $t \in \mathbf{I}, \sigma^t_n : H^t_n \to G_n$ be a homomorphism such that all diagrams commute (i.e. $\Pi_{m,n} \circ \sigma^t_n = \sigma^t_m \circ \pi^t_{m,n}$ for $m \le n < \omega$), and let σ^t_ω be the induced homomorphism from H^t_ω into G_ω.*
- (D) *$\mathbf{I}$ is countable*[1]
- (E) *For every $\mu < \lambda$ there is a sequence $\langle f_i \in G_\omega : i < \mu\rangle$ such that for $i \ne j \;\&\; t \in \mathbf{I} \Rightarrow f_i f_j^{-1} \notin$ Rang(σ^t_ω).*

Then there is $\langle f_i \in G_\omega : i < 2^\lambda\rangle$ such that
$i \ne j \;\&\; t \in \mathbf{I} \Rightarrow f_i f_j^{-1} \notin$ Rang(σ^t_ω).

This follows immediately from 1.2 below.

1.2 Lemma. *Assume for every $n < \omega, \mathscr{E}_n$ is an analytic equivalence relation on $\mathscr{P}(\omega) = \{A : A \subseteq \omega^+\}$ which satisfies*

- $(*)$ *if $A, B \subset \mathbf{Z}^+, n \notin B, A = B \cup \{n\}$, then A, B are not $\mathscr{E}_n$-equivalent.*

Then there is a perfect subset of $\mathscr{P}(\omega)$ of pairwise $\mathscr{E}_n$-nonequivalent $A \subseteq \omega$, simultaneously for all n.

Remark. The proof uses some knowledge of set theory and is close to [Sh 273, Lemma 1.3].

Proof. Let $r_m \in {}^\omega 2$ be the real parameter involved in the definition $\varphi_m(x, y, r_m)$ of $\mathscr{E}_m$. Let $\bar\varphi = \langle \varphi_m : m < \omega\rangle, \bar r = \langle r_m : m < \omega\rangle, \bar{\mathscr{E}} = \langle \bar{\mathscr{E}}_m : m < \omega\rangle$. Let N be a countable elementary submodel of $(\mathscr{H}((2^{\aleph_0})^+), \in)$ to which $\bar\varphi, \bar r, \bar{\mathscr{E}}$ belong. Now

- $(**)$ if $\langle A_1, A_2\rangle$ be a pair of subsets of ω^+ which is Cohen generic over N [this means that it belongs to no first category subset of $\mathscr{P}(\omega) \times \mathscr{P}(\omega)$ which belongs to N] then
  - (α) A_1, A_2 are $\mathscr{E}_m$-equivalent in $N[A_1, A_2]$ if they are $\mathscr{E}_m$-equivalent
  - (β) A_1, A_2 are non-$\mathscr{E}_m$-equivalent in $N[A_1, A_2]$.

---

[1] this is stronger, earlier $\mathbf{I}$ was finite

Proof of $(**)$.

- (α) by the absoluteness criterions (Levy Sheönfied)
- (β) if not, then some finite information forces this, hence for some n
  - $(*)$ if $\langle A'_1, A'_2\rangle$ is Cohen generic over N and $A'_1 \cap \{0,1,\dots,n\} = A_1 \cap \{0,1,\dots,n\}$ and $A'_2 \cap \{0,1,\dots,n\} = A_2 \cap \{1,\dots,n\}$ then $A'_1, A'_a 2$ are $\mathscr{E}_m$-equivalent in $N[A'_1, A'_2]$.

Let A''_1 be $A_1 \cup \{n+1\}$ if $(n+1) \notin A_1$ and $A_1 \backslash \{n+1\}$ if $(n+1) \in A_1$.

Trivially also $\langle A''_1, A_2\rangle$ is Cohen generic over N, hence by $(*)$ above A''_1, A_2 are $\mathscr{E}_m$-equivalent in $N[A''_1, A_2]$. By $(**)(1)$ we know that really A''_1, A_2 are $\mathscr{E}_m$-equivalent. As equivalence is a transitive relation clearly A_1, A''_1 are $\mathscr{E}_m$-equivalent. But this contradicts the hypothesis $(*)$.

We can easily find a perfect (nonempty) subset P of $\{A : A \subseteq \omega\}$ such that for any distinct $A, B \in P, (A,B)$ is Cohen generic over N. So for each m for $\neq B \in P, N[A,B] \models$ "A, B are not $\mathscr{E}_m$-equivalent" and by $(**)(\alpha)$ A, B are not $\mathscr{E}_m$-equivalent. This finishes the proof. $\square_{1.2}$

* * *

The same proof gives

1.3 Claim. *If* $\mathscr{E}$ *is a two-place relation on* $\mathscr{P}(\omega)$ *such that* $A \subseteq \omega, B \subseteq \omega, A = B \cup \{n\}, n \notin B, C \subseteq \omega \Rightarrow \neg A \mathscr{E} C \vee \neg B \in \mathscr{C}$, *then there is a perfect subset* $\mathbf{P}$ *of* $\mathscr{P}(\omega)$ *such that* $A \neq B \in \mathbf{P} \Rightarrow \neg A \mathscr{E} B$.

§2 On λ-analytic equivalence relations

2.1 Hypothesis. $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda)$ is fixed.

2.2 Definition. 1) A sequence A of relations $\bar{R} = \langle R_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*)\rangle$ on ${}^\lambda 2$ (equivalently $\mathscr{P}(\lambda)$) i.e. a sequence of definitions of such relations in $(\mathscr{H}(\lambda^+), \in)$ and with parameters in $\mathscr{H}(\lambda^+)$ is λ-w.c.a. (weakly Cohen absolute) if: for any $A \subseteq \lambda$

- (a) there are N, r such that:
  - (α) N is a transitive model
  - (β) $N^{<\lambda} \subseteq N, \lambda + 1 \subseteq N$, the sequence of the definitions of $\bar{R}$ belongs to N
  - (γ) $A \in N$
  - (δ) $r \in {}^\lambda 2$ is Cohen over N there is generic for $({}^{\lambda>}2, \triangleleft)$ over $N)$
  - (ε) R and $\neg R$ are absolute from $N[r]$ to V.

2) We say R is (λ, μ)-w.c.a. if for $A \subseteq \lambda$ we can find N, r_α (for $\alpha \in 2^\lambda$) such that satisfying clauses $(\alpha), (\beta), (\gamma)$ from above and

- $(\delta)'$ for $\eta \neq \nu \in {}^\lambda 2, (\eta, \nu)$ is a pair of Cohens over N
- $(\varepsilon)'$ $R, \neg R$ are absolute from $N[\eta, \nu]$ to V.

3) We say λ is (λ, μ)-w.c.a. if every λ-analytic relation on ${}^\lambda 2$ is (λ, μ)-w.c.a. That is, it has the form $(\exists Y_1, \dots, Y_m \subseteq \lambda \times \lambda)\varphi(Y_1, \dots, Y_m; X_1, \dots, X_n)$.

2.3 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) *for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(*) \leq \lambda, \mathscr{E}_\varepsilon$ is a (λ, μ)-w.c.a. equivalence relation on $\mathscr{P}(\lambda)$, more exactly a definition of one and*
- (b) *if $A, B \subseteq \lambda$ and $\alpha \in A \backslash B, A = B \cup \{\alpha\}$, then A, B are not $\mathscr{E}$-equivalent.*

Then there is a set $\mathscr{P} \subseteq \mathscr{P}(\lambda)$ of μ-pairwise non-$\mathscr{E}_\varepsilon$-equivalent members of $\mathscr{P}(\lambda)$ for all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(*)$ simultaneously.

2.4 Remark. If in 2.2 we ask that $\{r_\eta : \eta \in {}^\lambda 2\}$ perfect, then so is $\mathscr{P}$.

2.5 Definition. 1) $\mathscr{P} \subseteq \mathscr{P}(\lambda)$ is perfect if there is a λ-perfect $T \subseteq {}^{\lambda>}2$ (see below) such that $\mathscr{P} = \{\{\alpha < \lambda : \eta(\alpha) = 1\} : \eta \in \lim_\lambda(T)\}$.
2) T is a λ-perfect is:

- (a) $T \subseteq {}^{\lambda>}2$ is non-empty
- (b) $\eta \in T \ \& \ \alpha < \ell g(\eta) \Rightarrow \eta \restriction \alpha \in T$
- (c) if $\delta < \lambda$ is a limit ordinal, $\eta \in {}^\delta 2$ and $(\forall \alpha < \delta)(\eta \restriction \alpha \in T)$, then $\eta \in T$
- (d) if $\eta \in T, \ell g(\eta) < \alpha < \lambda$ then there is $\nu, \eta \triangleleft \nu \in T \cap {}^\alpha 2$
- (e) if $\eta \in T$ then there are $\triangleleft$-incomparable $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in T$ such that $\eta \triangleleft \nu_1 \ \& \ \eta \triangleleft \nu_1$.

3) $\mathrm{Lim}_\delta(T) = \{\eta : \ell g(\eta) = \delta \text{ and } (\forall \alpha < \delta)(\eta \restriction \alpha \in T)\}$.

Proof of 2.3.
Let $T^* = {}^{\lambda >}2$.
Let N and $r_\alpha \in {}^\lambda 2$ for $\alpha < \mu$ be as in Definition 2.2. We identify r_α with $\{\gamma < \lambda : r_\alpha(\gamma) = 1\}$.
It is enough to prove that, assuming $\alpha \neq \beta < \mu$

$(*)_1$ $\neg r_\alpha \mathscr{E}_\varepsilon r_\beta$.

By clause (ε) of Definition 2.2(2) it is enough to prove

$(*)_2$ $N[r_\alpha, r_\beta] \neq \neg r_\alpha \mathscr{E}_\varepsilon \nu_\beta$.

Assume this fails, so $N[r_\alpha, r_\beta] \neq r_\alpha \mathscr{E}_\varepsilon r_\beta$ then for some $i < \lambda$

$$(r_\alpha \restriction i, r_\beta \restriction i) \Vdash_{({}^{\lambda >}2) \times ({}^{\lambda >}2)} \text{“}\underset{\sim}{r}_1 \mathscr{E}_\varepsilon \underset{\sim}{r}_2\text{”}.$$

Define $r \in {}^\lambda 2$ by

$$r(j) = \begin{cases} r_\beta(j) & \underline{\text{if}}\ j \neq i \\ 1 - r_\beta(j) & \underline{\text{if}}\ j = i \end{cases}$$

So also (r_α, r) is a generic pair for ${}^{\lambda >}2 \times {}^{\lambda >}2$ over N and $(r_\alpha \restriction i, r \restriction i) = (r_\alpha \restriction i, r_\beta \restriction i)$ hence by the forcing theorem

$$N[r_\alpha, r] \models \underset{\sim}{r}_\alpha \mathscr{E}_\varepsilon r.$$

By $r_\alpha, r_\beta, r \in N[r_\alpha, r_\beta] = N[r_\alpha, r]$, so $N[r_\alpha, r_\beta] \models r_\beta \mathscr{E}_\varepsilon r$ hence $V \models r_\beta \mathscr{E}_\varepsilon r$, a contradiction to assumption (b). $\square_{2.3}$

2.6 Definition. We call Q a pseudo λ-Cohen forcing if:

- (a) $Q = \{p : p \text{ a partial functiom from } \lambda \text{ to } \{0,1\}\}$
- (b) $p \leq_Q q \Rightarrow p \subseteq q$
- (c) $\mathscr{I}_i = \{p : i \in \mathrm{Dom}(p)\}$ is dense for $i < \lambda$
- (d) define $F_i : \mathscr{I}_i \to \mathscr{I}_i$ by: $\mathrm{Dom}(F_i(p)) = \mathrm{Dom}(F_i(p))$

$$(F_i(p))(j) = \begin{cases} p(j) & \underline{\text{if}}\ j = i \\ 1 - p(j) & \underline{\text{if}}\ j \neq i \end{cases}$$

then F_i is an automorphism of $(\mathscr{I}_i, <^Q \restriction \mathscr{I}_i)$.

2.7 Claim. *In 2.2, 2.5 we can replace* $({}^{\lambda>}2, \triangleleft)$ *by* Q.

2.8 Observation: So in $V \models G.C.H., P$ is Easton forcing, then in V^P for every λ regular for $Q = (({}^{\lambda>}2)^V, \triangleleft)$ we have: Q is pseudo λ-Cohen and in V^P we have λ is $(\lambda, 2^\lambda)$-w.c.a.

2.9 Discussion: But in fact λ being $(\lambda, 2^\lambda)$- w.c.a. is a weak condition.

We can generalize further using the following definition

2.10 Definition. 1) For $r_0, r_1 \in {}^\lambda 2$ we say (r_0, r_1) or r_0, r_1 is an $\bar{R}$-pseudo Cohen pair over N if ($\bar{R}$ is a definition (in $(\mathscr{H}(\lambda^+), \in)$) of a relation on $\mathscr{P}(\lambda)$ (or ${}^\lambda 2$) and) for some forcing notion Q and Q-names $\underset{\sim}{r}_0, \underset{\sim}{r}_1$ and $G \subseteq Q$ $(G \in V)$ generic over N we have:

- (a) $\underset{\sim}{r}_0[G] = r_0, \underset{\sim}{r}_1[G] = r_1$
- (b) for every $p \in G, i < \lambda$ large enough and $\ell(*) < 2$ there is $G' \subseteq Q$ generic over N such that: $p \in G$ and $(\underset{\sim}{r}_\ell[G'])(j) = (\underset{\sim}{r}_\ell[G])(j) \Leftrightarrow (j, \ell) \neq (i, \ell(*))$
- (c) R is absolute from $N[G]$ and from $N[G']$ to V.

2) We say λ is μ-p.c.a for $\bar{R}$ if for every $x \in \mathscr{H}(\lambda^+)$ there are $N, \langle \eta_i : i < \mu \rangle$ such that:

- (a) N is a transitive model of ZFC^-
- (b) for $i \neq j < \mu, (r_i, r_j)$ is an $\bar{R}$-pseudo Cohen pair over N.

3) We omit R if this holds for any λ-sequence of $\sum^1_1$ formula in $\mathscr{H}(\lambda^+)$.

Clearly

2.11 Claim. *1) If* λ *is* μ*-p.c.a for* $\mathscr{E}, \mathscr{E}$ *an equivalence relation on* $\mathscr{P}(\lambda)$ *and* $A \subseteq B \subseteq \lambda$ & $|B \backslash A| = 1 \Rightarrow \neg A \mathscr{E} B$, *then* $\mathscr{E}$ *has* $\geq \mu$ *equivalence classes.*
2) Similarly if $\mathscr{E} = \bigvee\limits_{\varepsilon < \varepsilon(*)} \mathscr{E}_\varepsilon, \varepsilon(*) \leq \lambda$ *and each* $\mathscr{E}_\varepsilon$ *as above.*

§3 On λ-systems of groups

3.1 Hypothesis. $\lambda =$ cf(λ).

We may wonder does 3.3 have any cases it covers?

3.2 Definition. 1) We say $\mathscr{Y} = (\bar A, \bar K, \bar G, \bar D, g^*)$ is a λ-system if

(A) $\bar A = \langle A_i : i \le \lambda\rangle$ is an increasing sequence of sets, $A = A_\lambda = \bigcup\limits_i A_i$

(B) $\bar K = \langle K_t : t \in A\rangle$ is a sequence of finite groups

(C) $\bar G = \langle G_i : i \le \lambda\rangle$ is a sequence of groups, $G_i \subseteq \prod\limits_{t \in A_i} K_t$, each G_i is closed and $i < j \le \lambda \Rightarrow G_i = \{g \restriction A_i : g \in G_j\}$ and $G_\lambda = \{g \in \prod\limits_{t \in A_\lambda} K_t : (\forall i < \lambda)(g \restriction A_i \in G_i)$

(D) $\bar D = \langle D_\delta : \delta \le \lambda$ (a limit ordinal) $\rangle, D_\delta$ an ultrafilter on δ such that $\alpha < \delta \Rightarrow [\alpha, \delta) \in D_\delta$

(E) $\bar g^* = \langle g_i : i < \lambda\rangle, g_i \in G_\lambda$ and $g_i \restriction A_i = e_{G_i} = \langle e_{K_t} : t \in A_i\rangle$.

2) Let $\mathscr{Y}^-$ be the same omitting $\bar D$.

3.3 Definition. For a λ-system $\mathscr{Y}$ and $j \le \lambda + 1$ we say $\bar f_i \in$ cont$(j, \mathscr{Y})$ if:

(a) $\bar f = \langle f_i : i < j\rangle$

(b) $f_i \in G_\lambda$

(c) if $\delta < j$ is a limit ordinal then $f_\delta =$ Lim$_{D_\delta}(\bar f \restriction \delta)$ which means:

$$\text{for every } t \in A, f_\delta(t) = \text{ Lim}_{D_\delta}\langle f_i(t) : i < \delta\rangle$$

which means

$$\{i < \delta : f_\delta(t) = f_i(t)\} \in D_\delta.$$

3.4 Fact: 1) If $\bar f \in$ cont$(j, \mathscr{Y}), i < j$ then $\bar f \restriction i \in$ cont$(i, \mathscr{Y})$.

2) If $\bar f \in$ cont$(j, \mathscr{Y})$ and $j < \lambda$ is non-limit, and $f_j \in G_\lambda$ then

$$\bar f\,\hat{}\,\langle f_j\rangle \in \text{ cont}(j+1, \mathscr{Y}).$$

3) If $\bar f \in$ cont$(j, \mathscr{Y})$ and j is a limit ordinal $\le \lambda$, then for some unique $f_j \in G_\lambda$ we have $\bar f\,\hat{}\,\langle f_j\rangle \in$ cont$(j+1, \mathscr{Y})$.

4) If $j \le \lambda + 1, f \in G$ then $\bar f = \langle f : i < j\rangle \in$ cont$(j, \mathscr{Y})$.

5) If $\bar f, \bar g \in$ cont$(j, \mathscr{Y})$, then $\langle f_i g_i : i < j\rangle$ and $\langle f_i^{-1} : i < j\rangle$ belongs to cont$(j, \mathscr{Y})$.

Proof. Straight.

3.5 Definition. 1) If $\bar{g} \in {}^{j}(G_\lambda), j \le \lambda$ we define $f_{\bar{g}}$ by induction on j for all such $\bar{g}$ as follows:

$j = 0$: $f_{\bar{g}} = e_G = \langle e_{K_t} : t \in A \rangle$

$j = i + 1$: $f_{\bar{g}} = f_{\bar{g} \restriction i} g_i$

j limit: $f_{\bar{g}} = \text{Lim}_{D_\delta} \langle f_{\bar{g} \restriction i} : i < j \rangle$

2) We say $\bar{g}$ is trivial on X if $i \in X \cap \ell g(\bar{g}) \Rightarrow g_i = e_{G_\lambda}$.
3) For $\eta \in {}^{\lambda >}2$ let $\bar{g}^\eta = \langle f^\eta_i : i < \ell g(\eta) \rangle$, where

$$g^\eta_i = \begin{cases} g^*_i & \text{if } \eta(i) = 1 \\ e_{G_\lambda} & \text{if } \eta(i) = 0 \end{cases}$$

3.6 Claim. *1) If $i \le j$ and $\bar{g}, \bar{g}', \bar{g}'' \in {}^{j}(G_\lambda), \bar{g}' \restriction i = \bar{g} \restriction i, \bar{g}'$ is trivial on $[i, j)$, $\bar{g}'' \restriction [i, j) = \bar{g} \restriction [i, j)$ and $\bar{g}'''$ is trivial on i, then:*

$$f_{\bar{g}} = f_{\bar{g}'} f_{\bar{g}''} \text{ and } f_{\bar{g}'} = f_{\bar{g} \restriction i}.$$

2) For $\eta \in {}^{\lambda}2, f_{(\bar{g}^\eta)} =$ Lim$\langle f_{(\bar{g}, \eta \restriction i)} : i < \lambda \rangle$ (i.e. any ultrafilter D'_λ on λ containing the co-bounded sets will do).

Proof. Straight.

3.7 Claim. *1) Let $\mathscr{Y}^-$ be a λ-system, H_ε a subgroup of G_λ, for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(*) < \lambda$ and $\mathscr{E}_\varepsilon$ the equivalence relation $\bigwedge\limits_{t \in \mathbf{I}} [f'(f'')^{-1} \in H_t]$ and assume: $\lambda > i \ge \varepsilon \Rightarrow g^*_i \notin H_\varepsilon$*

- *(α) the assumption (A) of 3.3 holds with $f_A = f_{(\bar{g}^\eta)}$ when $A \subseteq \lambda, \eta \in {}^{\lambda}2, A = \{i : \eta(i) = 1\}$*
- *(β) if in addition $A_\varepsilon \subseteq \lambda^+, K_t \in \mathscr{H}(\lambda^+)$ and $\langle H_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*) \rangle$ is (λ, μ)-w.c.a., then also assumption (B) of 3.3 holds (hence its conclusion).*

3.8 Claim. *Assume*

- *(A) $\mathscr{Y}^-$ a λ-system, $A_i \subseteq \lambda^+, |A_i| \le \lambda, G_i \in \mathscr{H}(\lambda^+)$*
- *(B) $\varepsilon(*) \le \lambda, \bar{H} = \langle H^\varepsilon_i : i \le i(*) \rangle, \Pi^\varepsilon_{i,j} : H^\varepsilon_j \to H^\varepsilon_i$ a homomorphism, for $i_0 \le i_1 \le i_2$ we have $\Pi^\varepsilon_{i_0,i_1} \circ \Pi^\varepsilon_{i_1,i_2} = \Pi^\varepsilon_{i_0,i_2}, \sigma^\varepsilon_i : H^\varepsilon_t \to G_i, \sigma^\varepsilon_i \Pi^\varepsilon_{i,j}(f) = (\sigma^\varepsilon_j(f)) \restriction A_i, H^\varepsilon_\lambda, \sigma^\varepsilon_\lambda$ is the inverse limit (with $\Pi^\varepsilon_{i,\lambda}$) of $\langle H^\varepsilon_i, \sigma^\varepsilon_{i,j} : i \le j < \lambda \rangle$ and $i < \lambda \Rightarrow H^\varepsilon_i \in \mathscr{H}(\lambda^+)$*
- *(C) $H_\varepsilon =$ Rang$(\sigma^\varepsilon_\lambda)$.*

Then

- *(α) the assumptions of 4.10 holds*
- *(β) if λ is (λ, μ)-w.c.a. then also the conclusion of 4.10, 3.3 holds.*

Proof. Straight.

* * *

We can go one more step in concretization.

3.9 Claim. *1) Assume*

- (a) *L is an abelian group of cardinality λ*
- (b) *p a prime number*
- (c) *if $L' \subseteq L, |L'| < \lambda$, then $\mathrm{Ext}_p(L, L', \mathbb{Z}) \neq 0$*
- (d) *λ is μ-w.c.a. (in V).*

Then $\mu \le r_p(\mathrm{Ext}(G, \mathbb{Z}))$.
2) If $(a), (b), (d)$ above, $\mu > \lambda, \lambda$ strongly inaccessible then $r_p(\mathrm{Ext}(G, \mathbb{Z})) \notin [\lambda, \mu)$.

Proof. Without loss of generality G is $\aleph_1$-free (so torsion free).
Without loss of generality the set of elements of G is λ. Let $A = A_\lambda = \lambda, L_\lambda = L$, for $j < \lambda, A_j$ a proper initial segment of λ such that $L_j = L \restriction A_j$ is a pure subgroup of L, increasing continuously with j.
Let $K_t = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}, G_i = f \in$ HOM$(L_i, \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$.
Let $\varepsilon(*) = 1, H_i =$ HOM$(L_i, \mathbb{Z})$ and $(\sigma^\varepsilon_i(f))(x) = f(x) + p\mathbb{Z}, K_\varepsilon =$ Rang$(\sigma^\varepsilon_\lambda)$. We know that $r_p(\mathrm{Ext}(G, \mathbb{Z}))$ is $(G_\lambda : K_0)$. By assumption (d) for each $i < \lambda$ we can choose $g^*_i \in G_\lambda \backslash K_\varepsilon$ such that $g^*_i \restriction L_i$ is zero. $\square_{3.9}$

§4 Back to the p-rank of Ext

4.1 Definition. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi_{\mathbb{Z}} = \big\{\bar\lambda : \bar\lambda = \langle \lambda_p : p < \omega \text{ prime or zero}\rangle &\text{ and for some}\\ \text{abelian } (\aleph_1\text{-free}) \text{ group } L, \lambda_p = r_p\ &(\text{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z}))\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Clearly $\Xi_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is closed under products. Let $\mathbf{P}$ be the set of primes.

Remember that (see [Sh:f, AP], 2.7, 2.7A, 2.13(1),(2)).
4.2 Fact: 1) In the Easton model if G is $\aleph_1$-free not free, $G' \subseteq G, |G'| < |G| \Rightarrow G/G'$ not free then $r_0(\text{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})) = 2^{|G|}$.

4.3 Fact: 1) Assume μ is strong limit $> \aleph_0$, $\text{cf}(\mu) = \aleph_0, \lambda = \mu, 2^\mu = \mu^+$ and some $Y \subseteq [{}^\omega\mu]^\lambda$ is μ-free, (equivalently μ^+-free, see in proof).
Let $\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{P}_1$ be a partition of the primes.
Then for some $\aleph_1$-free abelian group $L, |L| = \mu^+, 2^\lambda = r_0\ (\text{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})), p \in \mathbf{P}_1 \Rightarrow \lambda_p(\text{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})) = 2^\lambda, p \in \mathbf{P}_0 \Rightarrow \lambda_p(\text{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})) = 0$.

Remark. On other cardinals see [MRSh 314].

Proof. Let $Y = \{\eta_i : i < \lambda\}$. Let $r : \mu^2 \rightarrow \mu$ be a pairing function, so $pr(pr_1(\alpha), pr_2(\alpha)) = \alpha$. Without loss of generality $\eta_i(n) = \eta_j(m) \Rightarrow n = m\ \ \&\ \ \eta_i \restriction m = \eta_j \restriction m$. Let L_0 be $\bigoplus\limits_{\alpha<\lambda} \mathbb{Z}x_\alpha$. Let $\langle f_i : i < \lambda\rangle$ list the functions $f \in$ HOM$(L, \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$. We choose by induction on $i < \lambda, (g_i, \nu_i, \ell_i)$ such that:

(α) $g_i \in$ HOM$(L,\mathbb{Z})$

(β) $(\forall x \in L)[g_i(x)/p\mathbb{Z} = f_i(x)]$

(γ) $\rho_i, \nu_i \in {}^\omega\mu, \eta_i(n) = pr_1(\nu_i(n)) = pr_1(\rho_i(n))$

(δ) $(\forall j \leq i)(\exists n < \omega)(\forall n)[n \leq m < \omega \rightarrow g_j(x_{\nu_i(m)}) = g_j(x_{\rho_i(m)})$

(1) (ε)" $(\forall j < i)(\exists n < \omega)(\forall m)(n \leq m < \omega \rightarrow g_i(x_{\nu_j(m)}) = g_i(x_{\nu_j(m)})$

(ζ) $\nu_i(n) \neq \rho_i(m)$.

Arriving to i let $h_i : i \rightarrow \omega$ be such that $\langle\{\eta_j \restriction \ell : \ell \in [h_i(j), \omega)\} : j < i\rangle$ are pairwise disjoint (possible as Y is μ^+-free). Now choose g_i such that clause (ε) holds with $n = h_i(j)$, as the choice of h, σ splits the problem. Let $i = \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} A^i_n, A^i_n \subseteq A^i_{n+1}, |A^i_n| < \mu$. Now choose by induction on $n, \alpha = \rho_i(n), \beta = \nu_i(n)$ as distinct ordinals $\in \{\alpha \in \mu : \alpha \notin \{\nu_i(m), \rho_i(m : m < m\}$ and $pr_1(\alpha) = \eta_i(n)\}$ such that $\langle g_j(x_{\nu_\alpha}) : j \in A^i_n\rangle = \langle g_j(x_\beta) : j \in A^i_n\rangle$.
Let L be generated by $L_0 \cup \{y_{i,m} : i < \lambda, m < \omega\}$ freely except that (the equations of L_0 and) $(\prod\limits_{p \in \mathbf{P}_0 \cap n} p)y_{i,n+1} = y_{i,n} + x_{\nu_i(n)} - x_{\rho_i(n)}$.

Discussion: Suppose $V \models 2^{\aleph_\alpha} = \aleph_{\alpha+2}$. If we use the Easton forcing, $2^{\aleph_n} = \aleph_{n+2}$ we get: $|G| < \aleph_\omega, G$ not free, $\lambda_p(\text{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z}))$ uncountable two. In $\aleph_{\omega+1}, \aleph_{\omega+2}$ have to look at [GiSh 597]. So $\text{CON}[(\forall L)(\text{Ext}(L,\mathbb{Z}) \neq 0 \to (\text{Ent}_p(L,\mathbb{Z}) \neq 0)]$ is hard.

4.4 Question: Do we have compactness for singular for $\text{Ext}_p(G,\mathbb{Z}) = 0$?

4.5 Claim. *Let* $V \models \kappa$ *is supercompact,* $\lambda = cf(\lambda) > \kappa, GCH$ *and* $\lambda = cf(\lambda) > \lambda_0 \Rightarrow \diamondsuit^*_\lambda$.
Then in some generic extension

- $(*)$ *if* L *is* $\aleph_1$*-free abelian group, not free* $L' \subseteq L$ & $|L'| < L \Rightarrow L/L'$ *not free then*
  - (α) $\lambda_0(Ext(L,\mathbb{Z})) = 2^{|L|}$
  - (β) $\lambda_p(Ext(L,\mathbb{Z})) = 2^{|L|}$.

Proof. Let P be adding λ Cohen reals.

4.6 Question: If $\bar{\lambda} \in \Xi_{\mathbb{Z}}$ can we derive $\bar{\lambda}' \in \Xi_{\mathbb{Z}}$ by increasing some λ_p's?

4.7 Question: Suppose we choose $\lambda > 2^{\aleph_0}$ strongly inaccessible, p^* prime and add by iterated forcing a G satisfying $r_0(\text{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})) = 2^\lambda, r_{p^*}(\text{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})) = 0$. Does not $\bar{\lambda} \in \Xi_{\mathbb{Z}}$ & $p \neq p^* \Rightarrow \lambda_p = \lambda_0$?

4.8 Fact: If $\bar{\lambda}^i = \langle \lambda^i_p : p \in \mathbf{P} \cup \{0\} \rangle \in \Xi_{\mathbb{Z}}$ for $i < \alpha$ and $\lambda_p = \prod\limits_{i<\alpha} \lambda^i_p$, then $\langle \lambda_p : p \in \mathbf{P} \cup \{0\} \rangle \in \Xi_{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Proof. As if $G = \bigoplus\limits_{i<\alpha}$ then $\text{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z}) = \prod\limits_{i<\lambda} \text{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})$ hence $\lambda_p(\text{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})) = \prod\limits_{i<\alpha} \lambda_p(\text{Ext}(G_i,\mathbb{Z}))$.

4.9 Concluding Remark: In [EkSh 505] the statement "there is a W-abelian group" is characterized.

We can similarly characterize "there is a separable group". We have the same characterization for "there is a non-free abelian group" such that for some p, $r_p(\text{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z})) = 0$.

Question: Can $\mathbf{P}^* = \{p : p \text{ prime and } \bar{\lambda} \in \Xi_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{ \& } \lambda_0 > 0 \Rightarrow \lambda_p > 0\}$ be $\notin \{\emptyset, \mathbf{P}\}$?

4.10 Claim. *If* λ *is strong inaccessible or* $\lambda = \mu^+, \mu$ *strong limit singular of cofinality* $\aleph_0, S \subseteq \{\delta < \lambda : cf(\delta) = \aleph_0\}$ *is stationary not reflecting and* $\diamondsuit^*_S$ *and* $\mathbf{P}_0$ *a set of primes, then there is a* λ*-free abelian group* G *such that* $r_0(Ext(G,\mathbb{Z}) = 2^\lambda, r_p(Ext(G,\mathbb{Z})) = 0$ *and:* $p \in \mathbf{P}_0 \Rightarrow r_p(Ext(G,\mathbb{Z})) = 2^\lambda$ *and* p *prime and* $p \notin \mathbf{P}_0 \Rightarrow r_p(Ext(G,\mathbb{Z}) = 0$.

§5 Strong limit of countable cofinality

We continue [GrSh 302a]. For consistency of "no examples" see [MkSh 418].

5.1 Theorem. 1) We say $\mathscr{A}$ is a $(\lambda, \mathbf{I})$-system if $\mathscr{A} = (\lambda, \mathbf{I}, \bar{G} = \langle G_\alpha : \alpha \leq \omega\rangle, \bar{H}^t = \langle H^t_\alpha : \alpha \leq \omega\rangle, \bar{\pi} = \langle \pi_{\alpha,\beta}, \pi^t_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha \leq \beta \leq \omega, t \in \mathbf{I}\rangle, \bar{\sigma} = \langle \sigma_t : t \in \mathbf{I}\rangle)$ satisfies (we may write $\lambda^{\mathscr{A}}, \pi^{t,\mathscr{A}}_{\alpha,\beta}$, etc.)

- (A) λ is $\aleph_0$ or generally a cardinal of cofinality $\aleph_0$
- (B) $\langle G_m, \pi_{m,n} : m \leq n < \omega\rangle$ is an inverse system whose inverse limit is G_ω with $\pi_{n,\omega}$ such that $|G_n| \leq \lambda$. (So $\pi_{m,n}$ is a homomorphism from G_n to $G_m, \alpha \leq \beta \leq \gamma \leq \omega \Rightarrow \pi_{\alpha,\beta} \circ \pi_{\beta,\gamma} = \pi_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $\pi_{\alpha,\alpha}$ is the identity).
- (C) $\mathbf{I}$ is an index set of cardinality $\leq \lambda$. For every $t \in \mathbf{I}$ we have $\langle H^t_m, \pi^t_{m,n} : m \leq n < \omega\rangle$ is an inverse system of groups and H^t_ω with $\pi^t_{n,\omega}$ being the corresponding inverse limit H^t_ω with $\pi^t_{m,\omega}$ and H^t_m has cardinality $\leq \lambda$.
- (D) for every $t \in \mathbf{I}, \sigma^t_n : H^t_n \to G_n$ is a homomorphism such that all diagrams commute (i.e. $\pi_{m,n} \circ \sigma^t_n = \sigma^t_m \circ \pi^t_{m,n}$ for $m \leq n < \omega$), and let σ^t_ω be the induced homomorphism from H^t_ω into G_ω
- (E) $G_0 = \{e_{G_0}\}, H^t_0 = \{e_{H^t_0}\}$ (just for simplicity).

2) We say $\mathscr{A}$ is strict if $|G_n| < \lambda, |H^t_n| < \lambda, |\mathbf{I}| < \lambda$. Let $\mathscr{E}_t$ be the following equivalence relation on $G_\omega : f\mathscr{E}_t g$ iff $fg^{-1} \in$ Rang(σ^t_ω).
3) Let nu$(\mathscr{A}) = \sup\{\mu :$ for each $n < \omega,$ there is a sequence $\langle f_i : i < \mu\rangle$ such that $f_i \in G_\omega$ and $\mu \leq \lambda \Rightarrow \pi_{n,\omega}(f_i) = \pi_{n,\omega}(f_0)$ for $i < \mu$ and $i < j < \mu \;\;\&\;\; t \in I \Rightarrow \neg f_i \mathscr{E}_t f_j\}$.
We write nu$(\mathscr{A}) =^+ \mu$ to mean that moreover the supremum is obtained. Let nu$^+(\mathscr{A})$ is the first μ such that there is no $\langle f_i : i < \mu\rangle$ as above (so nu$(\mathscr{A}) \leq$ nu$^+(\mathscr{A}) \leq$ nu$(\mathscr{A})^+$ and nu$(\mathscr{A}) <$ nu$^+(\mathscr{A})$ implies nu$(\mathscr{A})$ is a limit cardinal and the supremum not obtained).
4) We say $\mathscr{A}$ is an explicit $(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{J})$-system if: $\mathscr{A} = (\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}, \bar{G}, \bar{H}, \bar{\pi}, \bar{\sigma})$ and

- (α) $\bar{\lambda} = \langle \lambda_n : n < \omega\rangle, \bar{\mathbf{J}} = \langle \mathbf{J}_n : n < \omega\rangle$
- (β) $\lambda_n < \lambda_{n+1}, \mathbf{J}_n \subseteq \mathbf{J}_{n+1},$
- (γ) letting $\lambda^{\mathscr{A}} = \sum\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda_n, \mathbf{I}^{\mathscr{A}} = \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} \mathbf{J}_n$ we have sys$(\mathscr{A}) =: (\lambda, \mathbf{I}, \bar{G}, \bar{H}, \bar{\pi}, \bar{\sigma})$ is a $(\lambda, \mathbf{I})$-system
- (δ) $|\mathbf{J}_n| \leq \lambda_n, |G_n| \leq \lambda_m, |H^t_n| < \lambda$ and $|H^n_t| \leq |H^{n+1}_t|$.

5) We add in (4), full if

- (ε) $|H^t_n| \leq \lambda_n$.

Second assume cf$(\mu) = \aleph_0$, so let $\mu = \sum\limits_{n<\omega} \mu_n, \mu_n < \mu_{n+1}$, and without loss of generality $\lambda_n < \mu_n =$ cf(μ_n) and $\mu > \lambda \Rightarrow \mu_n > \lambda$. If $\mu > \lambda$, for each n there is a witness $\langle f^n_\alpha : \alpha < \mu_n\rangle$ to nu$^+(\mathscr{A}) > \mu_n$, so $f^n_\alpha \in G^{\mathscr{A}}_\omega$ and as $\mu_n > \lambda \geq |G^{\mathscr{A}}_n|$, without loss of generality $\pi_{n,\omega}(f^n_\alpha) = \pi_{n,\omega}(f^0_\alpha)$. Now for some increasing $\eta \in {}^\omega\omega$ we

have $n < \omega \ \& \ \alpha < \mu_n \Rightarrow \pi_{n,\omega}(f^n_\alpha) \in G_n$ and we can continue as above.
Lastly, assume $\mu = \lambda$, then rereading Definition 5.1(3), we can choose $\mu_n = \lambda^+_n, \langle f^n_\alpha : \alpha < \mu_n\rangle$ as above, and continue as above.

5.2 Claim. *1) For any strict* $(\lambda, \mathbf{I})$*-system* $\mathscr{A}$ *there is an explicit* $(\bar\lambda, \bar{\mathbf{J}})$*-system* $\mathscr{B}$ *such that* $sys(\mathscr{B}) = \mathscr{A}$ *so*

$$\lambda = \sum_{n<\omega} \lambda_n, \mathbf{I} = \bigcup_{n<\omega} \mathbf{J}_n, \ nu(\mathscr{B}) = nu(\mathscr{A})$$

(and if in one side the supremum is obtained, so in the other).
2) For any $(\lambda, \mathbf{I})$*-system* $\mathscr{A}$ *such that* $\lambda > 2^{\aleph_0}$ *and* $nu^+(\mathscr{A}) > \mu$, $cf(\mu) \notin [\aleph_1, 2^{\aleph_0}]$ *there is an explicit* $(\bar\lambda, \bar{\mathbf{J}})$*-system* $\mathscr{B}$ *such that* $\lambda^{\mathscr{A}} = \sum\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda^{\mathscr{B}}_n, \mathbf{I}^{\mathscr{A}} = \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} \mathbf{J}^{\mathscr{B}}_n$ *and* $nu^+(\mathscr{B}) > \mu$.
3) In part (2) if $f : Card \cap \lambda \to Card$ *is increasing we can demand* $\lambda_n \in Rang(f)$, $f(\lambda_n) < \lambda_{n+1}$. *So if* λ *is strong limit* $> \aleph_0$, *then we can demand* $2^{\lambda^{\mathscr{B}}_n} < \lambda^{\mathscr{B}}_{n+1} = cf(\lambda^{\mathscr{B}}_{n+1})$.

Proof. 1) Straight.
2) Let $\bar\lambda = \langle \lambda_n : n < \omega\rangle$ be such that $\lambda = \sum\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda_n, 2^{\aleph_0} < \lambda_n < \lambda_{n+1}$, $\text{cf}(\lambda_n) = \lambda_n$.
Let $\langle G_{n,\ell} : \ell < \omega\rangle$ be increasing, $G_{n,\ell}$ a subgroup of G_n of cardinality $\le \lambda_\ell$ and $G_n = \bigcup\limits_{\ell<\omega} G_{n,\ell}$. Let $\langle H^t_{n,\ell} : \ell < \omega\rangle$ be an increasing sequence of subgroups of H^t_n with union $H^t_n, |H^t_{n,\ell}| \le \lambda_\ell$. Let $\langle \mathbf{J}_n : n < \omega\rangle$ be an increasing sequence of subsets of $\mathbf{I}$ with union $\mathbf{I}$ such that $|\mathbf{J}_n| \le \lambda_n$.

Without loss of generality $\pi_{m,n}$ maps $G_{n,\ell}$ into $G_{m,\ell}$ and $\pi^t_{m,n}$ maps $H^t_{n,\ell}$ into $H^t_{m,\ell}$ and σ^t_n maps $H^t_{n,\ell}$ into $G^t_{n,\ell}$ (why? just chose witness).

Now for every increasing $\eta \in {}^\omega\omega$ we let

$$G^\eta_\omega = \{g \in G_\omega : \text{ for every } n < \omega \text{ we have } \pi_{n,\omega}(g) \in G_{n,\eta(n)}\}.$$

Clearly

$(*)_1(\alpha)$ G^η_ω is a subgroup of $G_{\omega,\eta}$ and
(β) $\{G^\eta_\omega : \eta \in {}^\omega\omega \text{ increasing}\}$ is directed
(γ) $G_\omega = \cup\{G^\eta_\omega : \eta \in {}^\omega\omega \text{ (increasing)}\}$.

First assume $\text{cf}(\mu) \ne \aleph_0$ so as $\text{cf}(\mu) > 2^{\aleph_0}$ for some $\eta \in {}^\omega\omega$, strictly increasing, we have

$(*)_2$ $\text{nu}(\mathscr{A})$ is equal to $\sup\{|X| : X \subseteq G_{\omega,\eta}$ and $t \in \mathbf{I} \ \& \ f \ne g \in X \Rightarrow fg^{-1} \notin \sigma^t_\omega(H^t_\omega)\}$
(moreover, if one supremum is attained then so does the other).

For each strictly increasing $\nu \in {}^\omega\omega$ let $H^{(t,\nu)}_\omega$ be the subgroup $\{g \in H^t_\omega :$ for every $n < \omega$ we have $\sigma_{n,\omega}(g) \in H^{(t,\nu)}_\alpha\}$. So let $\mathbf{J}'_n = \{(t,\nu) : t \in \mathbf{J}$ and $\nu \in {}^\omega\omega$ increasing$\}$. We define $G_{n,\eta(n),\zeta}$, a subgroup of $G_{n,\eta(n)}$, decreasing with ζ by induction on ζ:

$\underline{\zeta = 0}$: $G_{n,\eta(n),\zeta} = G_{n,\eta(n)}$

$\underline{\zeta = \varepsilon + 1}$:
$$G_{n,\eta(n),\zeta} = \{x : x \in G_{n,\eta(n),\varepsilon} \text{ and } x \in \text{ Rang}(\pi_{n,n+1} \restriction G_{n+1,\eta(n+1),\varepsilon}) \text{ and } n > 0 \Rightarrow \pi_{n-1,n}(x) \in G_{n-1,\eta(n-1),\varepsilon}\}$$

$\underline{\zeta \text{ limit}}$: $G_{n,\eta(n),\zeta} = \bigcap\limits_{\varepsilon<\zeta} G_{n,\eta(n),\varepsilon}$.

Let $G^\eta_n = \bigcap\limits_{\zeta<\lambda^+} G_{n,\eta(n),\zeta}, \pi^\eta_{m,n} = \pi_{m,n} \restriction G^\eta_n$. Easily $\langle G^\eta_n, \pi^\eta_{m,n} : m \le n < \omega\rangle$ is directed with limit G^η_ω with $\pi^\eta_{n,\omega} = \pi_{n,\omega} \restriction G^\eta_\omega$.

Define $H^{(t,\nu)}_n, \pi^{(t,\nu)}_{m,m}$ parallely to $G^\eta_n, \pi^\eta_{m,n}$ but such that σ^t_α maps $H^{(t,\nu)}_\alpha$ into G^η_α (note: element of $H^{(t,\nu)}_\alpha$ not mapped to G^η_α are irrelevant).
Let $\sigma^{(t,\nu)}_\alpha : H^{(t,\nu)}_\alpha \to G^\eta_\omega$ be $\sigma^t_\alpha \restriction H^{(t,\nu)}_\omega$ and $\sigma^{(t,\sigma)}_n = \sigma^t_n \restriction H^{(t,\nu)}_n$.

We have defined actually $\bar{B} = (\bar{\lambda}^{\mathscr{B}}, \bar{\mathbf{J}}^{\mathscr{B}}, \bar{G}, \bar{H}, \bar{\pi}^{\mathscr{B}}, \bar{\sigma}^{\mathscr{B}})$ where
$\bar{\lambda}^{\mathscr{B}} = \langle \lambda_n : n < \omega\rangle, \mathbf{J}^{\mathscr{B}} = \langle \mathbf{J}_n \times {}^\omega\omega : n < \omega\rangle, \bar{G}^{\mathscr{B}} = \langle G^\eta_\alpha : \alpha \le \omega\rangle$,

$$\bar{H}^{\mathscr{B}} = \left\langle \langle H^x_\alpha : \alpha \le \omega\rangle : x \in \bigcup_n \mathbf{J}_n \right\rangle,$$

$$\bar{\pi}^{\mathscr{B}} = \langle \pi^\eta_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha \le \beta \le \omega\rangle{}^\frown \left\langle \langle \pi^{(t,\nu)}_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha \le \beta \le \omega\rangle : (t,\nu) \in \bigcup_n \mathbf{J}_n \right\rangle \text{ and}$$

$$\bar{\sigma}^{\mathscr{B}} = \left\langle \langle \sigma^{(t,\nu)}_\alpha : \alpha \le \omega\rangle : (t,\nu) \in \bigcup_{n<\omega} \mathbf{J}_n \right\rangle.$$

We have almost finished. Still G^η_n may be of cardinality $> \lambda_n$ but note that for $k : \omega \to \omega$ non-decreasing with limit $\omega, \langle G^\eta_n : n < \omega\rangle$ can be replaced by $\langle G_{k(n)} : n < \omega\rangle$. $\square_{5.2}$

For the rest of this section we adopt:

5.3 Convention. 1) $\mathscr{A}$ is an explicit $(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mathbf{J}})$-system, so below $\text{rk}_t(g,f)$ should be written as $\text{rk}_t(g,f,\mathscr{A})$, etc.
2) $\lambda = \sum\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda_n, \lambda_n = \lambda^{\mathscr{A}}_n, \mathbf{J}_n = \mathbf{J}^{\mathscr{A}}_n, \mathbf{I} = \mathbf{I}^{\mathscr{A}} = \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} \mathbf{J}_n, G_\alpha = G^{\mathscr{A}}_\alpha$, etc.
3) $k_t(n) = \text{ Max}\{m : m \le n, |H^t_m| \le \lambda_n\}$ so $k_t : \omega \to \omega$ is non-decreasing converging to ∞.
For the reader's convenience we repeat 5.5 - 5.8 from *Gr*.

5.4 Definition. 1) For $g \in H^t_\alpha$ let $\text{lev}(g) = \alpha$ (without loss of generality this is well defined).
2) For $\alpha \le \beta \le \omega, g \in H^t_\beta$ let $g \restriction H^t_\alpha = \pi^t_{\alpha,\beta}(g)$ and we say $g \restriction H^t_\alpha$ is below g and g is above $g \restriction H^t_\alpha$ or extend $g \restriction H^t_\alpha$.
3) For $\alpha \le \beta \le \omega, f \in G_\beta$ let $f \restriction G_\alpha = \pi_{\alpha,\beta}(f)$.
We will now describe the rank function used in the proof of the main theorem.

5.5 Definition. 1) For $g \in H^t_n, f \in G_\omega$ we say that (g,f) is a nice t-pair if $\sigma^t_n(g) = f \restriction G_n$.
2) Define a ranking function $\text{rk}_t(g,f)$ for any nice t-pair. First by induction on the ordinal α (we can fix $f \in G_\omega$), we define when $\text{rk}_t(g,f) \geq \alpha$ simultaneously for all $n < \omega, g \in H^t_n$

- (a) $\text{rk}_t(g,f) \geq 0$ iff (g,f) is a nice t-pair
- (b) $\text{rk}_t(g,f) \geq \delta$ for a limit ordinal δ iff for every $\beta < \delta$ we have $\text{rk}_t(g,f) \geq \beta$
- (c) $\text{rk}_t(g,f) \geq \beta + 1$ iff (g,f) is a nice t-pair, and letting $n = \text{lev}(g)$ there exists $g' \in H^t_{n+1}$ extending g such that $\text{rk}_t(g',f) \geq \beta$
- (d) $\text{rk}_t(g,f) \geq -1$.

3) For α an ordinal or -1 (stipulating $-1 < \alpha < \infty$ for any ordinal α) we have $\text{rk}_t(g,f) = \alpha$ iff $\text{rk}_t(g,f) \geq \alpha$ and it is false that $\text{rk}_t(g,f) \geq \alpha + 1$.
4) $\text{rk}_t(g,f) = \infty$ iff for every ordinal α we have $\text{rk}_t(g,f) \geq \alpha$.

The following two claims give the principal properties of $\text{rk}_t(g,f)$.

5.6 Claim. *Let (g,f) be a nice t-pair.*
1) The following statements are equivalent:

- (a) *$rk_t(g,f) = \infty$*
- (b) *there exists $g' \in H^t_\omega$ extending g such that $\sigma^t_\omega(g') = f$.*

2) If $rk_t(g,f) < \infty$, then $rk_t(g,f) < \mu^+$ where $\mu = \sum\limits_{n<\omega} 2^{\lambda_n}$ (for λ strong limit, $\mu = \lambda$).
3) If g' is a proper extension of g and (g',f) is also a nice t-pair then

- (α) *$rk_t(g',f) \leq rk_t(g,f)$ and*
- (β) *if $0 \leq rk_t(g,f) < \infty$ then the inequality is strict.*

Proof.
1) Statement $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$.
Let n be the value such that $g \in H^t_n$. If we will be able to define $g_k \in H^t_k$ for $k < \omega, k \geq n$ such that

- (i) $g_n = g$
- (ii) g_k is below g_{k+1} that is $\pi^t_{k,k+1}(g_{k+1}) = g_k$ and
- (iii) $\text{rk}_t(g_k,f) = \infty$,

then clearly we will be done since $g' =: \lim\limits_k g_k$ is as required. The definition is by induction on $k \geq n$.
For $k = n$ let $g_0 = g$.
For $k \geq n$, suppose g_k is defined. By (iii) we have $\text{rk}_t(g_k,f) = \infty$, hence for every ordinal α, $\text{rk}_t(g,f) > \alpha$ hence there is $g^\alpha \in H^t_{k+1}$ extending g such that $\text{rk}_t(g^\alpha,f) \geq \alpha$. Hence there exists $g^* \in H^t_{k+1}$ extending g_k such that $\{\alpha : g^\alpha = g^*\}$ is unbounded hence $\text{rk}_t(g^*,f) = \infty$, and let $g_{k+1} =: g^*$.

Statement $(b) \Rightarrow (a)$.
Since g is below g', it is enough to prove by induction on α that for every $k \geq n$ when $g_k =: g' \restriction H^t_k$ we have that $\text{rk}_t(g, f) \geq \alpha$.

For $\alpha = 0$, since $\sigma^t_\omega(g') = f \restriction G_n$ clearly for every k we have $\sigma^t_k(g_k) = f \restriction G_k$ so (g_k, f) is a nice t-pair.

For limit α, by the induction hypothesis for every $\beta < \alpha$ and every k we have $\text{rk}_t(g_k, f) \geq \beta$, hence by Definition 5.5(2)(b), $\text{rk}_t(g_k, f) \geq \alpha$.

For $\alpha = \beta+1$, by the induction hypothesis for every $k \geq n$ we have $\text{rk}_t(g_k, f) \geq \beta$. Let $k_0 \geq n$ be given. Since g_{k_0} is below g_{k_0+1} and $\text{rk}_t(g_{k_0+1}, f) \geq \beta$, Definition 5.5(2)(c) implies that $\text{rk}_t(g_{k_0}, f) \geq \beta+1$; i.e. for every $k \geq n$ we have $\text{rk}_t(g_k, f) \geq \alpha$. So we are done.
2) Let $g \in H^t_n$ and $f \in G_\omega$ be given. It is enough to prove that if $\text{rk}_t(g, f) \geq \lambda^+$ then $\text{rk}_t(g, f) = \infty$. Using part (1) it is enough to find $g' \in H^t_\omega$ such that g is below g' and $f = \sigma^t_\omega(g')$.

We define by induction on $k < \omega, g_k \in H^t_{n+k}$ such that g_k is below g_{k+1} and $\text{rk}_t(g_k, f) \geq \mu^+$. For $k = 0$ let $g_k = g$. For $k+1$, for every $\alpha < \mu^+$, as $\text{rk}_t(g_k, f) > \alpha$ by 5.5(2)(c) there is $g_{k,\alpha} \in G_{n+k+1}$ extending g_k such that $\text{rk}_t(g_{k,\alpha}, f) \geq \alpha$. But the number of possible $g_{k,\alpha}$ is $\leq |H^t_{n+k+1}| \leq 2^{\lambda_n} + k + 1 < \mu^+$ hence there are a function g and a set $S \subseteq \mu^+$ of cardinality λ^+ such that $\alpha \in S \Rightarrow g_{k,\alpha} = g$. Then take $g_{k+1} = g$.
3) Immediate from the definition. $\square_{5.6}$

5.7 Lemma. *1) Let (g, f) be a nice t-pair. Then we have $rk(g, f) \leq rk(g^{-1}, f^{-1})$.*
2) For every nice t-pair (g, f) we have $rk(g, f) = rk(g^{-1}, f^{-1})$.

Proof. 1) By induction on α prove that $\text{rk}(g, f) \geq \alpha \Rightarrow \text{rk}(g^{-1}, f^{-1}) \geq \alpha$ (see more details in Lemma 5.8).
2) Apply part (1) twice. $\square_{5.7}$

5.8 Lemma. *1) Let $n < \omega$ be fixed, and let $(g_1, f_1), (g_2, f_2)$ be nice t-pairs with $g_\ell \in H^t_n (\ell = 1, 2)$. Then (g_1g_2, f_1f_2) is a nice pair and $rk_t(g_1g_2, f_1f_2) \geq Min\{rk_t(g_\ell, f_\ell) : \ell = 1, 2\}$.*
2) Let $n, (f_1, g_1)$ and (f_2, g_2) be as above. If $rk_t(g_1, f_1) \neq rk_t(g_2, f_2)$, then $rk_t(g_1g_2, f_1f_2) = Min\{rk_t(g_\ell, f_\ell) : \ell = 1, 2\}$.

Proof. 1) It is easy to show that the pair is t-nice. We show by induction on α simultaneously for all $n < \omega$ and every $g_1, g_2 \in H^t_n$ that $\text{Min}\{\text{rk}(g_\ell, f_\ell) : \ell = 1, 2\} \geq \alpha$ implies that $\text{rk}(g_1g_2, f_1f_2) \geq \alpha$.

When $\alpha = 0$ or α is a limit ordinal this should be clear. Suppose $\alpha = \beta + 1$ and that $\text{rk}(g_\ell, f_\ell) \geq \beta + 1$; by the definition of rank for $\ell = 1, 2$ there exists $g'_\ell \in H^t_{n+1}$ extending g_ℓ such that (g'_ℓ, f_ℓ) is a nice pair and $\text{rk}_t(g'_\ell, f_\ell) \geq \beta$. By the induction assumption $\text{rk}_t(g'_1g'_2, f_1f_2) \geq \beta$. Hence $g'_1g'_2$ is as required in the definition of $\text{rk}_t(g_1g_2, f_1f_2) \geq \beta + 1$.
2) Suppose without loss of generality that $\text{rk}(g_1, f_1) < \text{rk}(g_2, f_2)$, let $\alpha_1 = \text{rk}(g_1, f_1)$ and let $\alpha_2 = \text{rk}_t(g_2, f_2)$. By part (1), $\text{rk}_t(g_1g_2, f_1f_2) \geq \alpha_1$, by Proposition 5.7, $\text{rk}_t(g_2^{-1}, f_2^{-1}) = \alpha_2 > \alpha_1$. So we have

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_1 = &\ \mathrm{rk}_t(g_1, f_1) = \ \mathrm{rk}_t(g_1 g_2 g_2^{-1}, f_1 f_2 f_2^{-1}) \\ \geq &\ \mathrm{Min}\{\mathrm{rk}_t(g_1 g_2, f_1 f_2), \mathrm{rk}_t(g_2^{-1}, f_2^{-1})\} \\ = &\ \mathrm{rk}_t(g_1 g_2, f_1 f_2) \geq \alpha_1.\end{aligned}$$

Hence the conclusion follows. $\square_{5.8}$

5.9 Theorem. *Assume*

- *(a)* λ *is strong limit* $\lambda >\ cf(\lambda) = \aleph_0$
- *(b)* $nu(\mathscr{A}) \geq \lambda$.

Then $nu(\mathscr{A}) =^{+} 2^{\lambda}$.

The proof is broken into parts.
5.10 Fact: Choose by induction on $n, \langle f_{n,i} : i < \lambda_n \rangle$ such that

- (α) $f_{n,i} \in G_\omega$ and $f_{n,i} \restriction G_{n+1} = e_{G_{n+1}}$
- (β) $i < j < \lambda_n \ \ \&\ \ t \in \mathbf{I} \Rightarrow \neg f_{n,i} \mathscr{E}_t f_{n,j}$
- (γ) $\mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_k}, f_{n,i} f^{-1}_{n,j}) < \infty$ for any $t \in \mathbf{J}_n$ and $i \neq j < \lambda_n$ and $k = k_t$ (follows from clause (β))
- (δ) if f^* belongs to the subgroup of G_ω generated by the $\{f_{m,j} : m < n, j < \lambda_m\}$ and $t \in \mathbf{J}_n, g \in \bigcup\limits_{m \leq k_t(n)} H^t_{k_t(n)}$, then for every $i_0 < i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < \lambda_n$ each of the following statements have the same truth value, i.e. the truth value does not depend on (i_0, i_1, i_2, i_3))
  - (i) $\mathrm{rk}_t(g, f_{n,i_1} f^{-1}_{n,i_0} f^* f_{n,i_2} f^{-1}_{n,i_3}) < \infty$
  - (ii) $\mathrm{rk}_t(g, f_{n,i_3} f^{-1}_{n,i_2} f^* f_{n,i_0} f^{-1}_{n,i_1}) < \infty$
  - (iii) $\mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(n)}}, f_{n,i_1} f^{-1}_{n,i_0}) <\ \mathrm{rk}_t(g, f^*)$
  - (iv) $\mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(n)}}, f_{n,i_1} f^{-1}_{n,i_0}) >\ \mathrm{rk}_t(g, f^*)$
  - (v) $\mathrm{rk}_t(g, f^*) <\ \mathrm{rk}_t(g, f_{n,i_0} f^{-1}_{n,i_1} f^* f_{n,i_2} f^{-1}_{n,i_3})$
  - (vi) $\mathrm{rk}_t(g, f^*) <\ \mathrm{rk}_t(g, f_{n,i_2} f^{-1}_{n,i_3} f^* f_{n,i_0} f^{-1}_{n,i_1})$
- (ε) for each $t \in \mathbf{J}_n$ one of the following occurs:
  - (a) for $i_0 < i_1 \leq i_2 < i_3 < \lambda_n$ we have
    $\mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(n)}}, f_{n,i_0} f^{-1}_{n,i_1}) <\ \mathrm{rk}(e_{H^t_{k_t(n)}}, f_{n,i_2} f^{-1}_{n,i_3})$
  - (b) for some γ^n_t for every $i < j < \lambda_n$ we have
    $\gamma^n_t =\ \mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(n)}}, f_{n,i} f^{-1}_{n,j})$.

Proof. We can satisfy clauses $(\alpha), (\beta)$ by the definitions and clause (γ) follows. Now clause (δ) is straight by Erdös Rado Theorem applied to a higher n.
For clause (ε) notice the transitivity of the order and of equality. $\square_{5.10}$

5.11 Notation. For $\alpha \leq \omega$ let $T_\alpha = \times_{k<\alpha}\lambda_k, T =: \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} T_n$ (note: treeness used).

5.12 Definition. Now by induction on $n < \omega$, for every $\eta \in \prod\limits_{m<n} \lambda_m$ we define $f_\eta \in G_\omega$ as follows:

for $n = 0$: $f_\eta = f_{<>} = e_{G_\omega}$

for $n = m+1$: $f_\eta = f_{m,2\eta(m)+1} f^{-1}_{m,2\eta(m)} f_{\eta\restriction m}$.

5.13 Fact. For $\eta \in T_\omega$ and $m \leq n < \omega$ we have

$$f_{\eta\restriction n} \restriction G_{m+1} = f_{\eta\restriction m} \restriction G_{m+1}.$$

Proof. As $\pi_{n,\omega}$ is a homomorphism it is enough to prove $(f_{\eta\restriction n}(f_{\eta\restriction m})^{-1}) \restriction G_{n+1} = e_{G_{n+1}}$, hence it is enough to prove $n \leq k < \omega \Rightarrow (f_{\eta\restriction k} f^{-1}_{\eta\restriction(k+1)}) \restriction G_{n+1} = e_{G_{n+1}}$ which follows from $k < \omega \Rightarrow f_{\eta\restriction k} f^{-1}_{\eta\restriction(k+1)} \restriction G_{k+1} = e_{G_{k+1}}$, which follows from $f_{k,\eta(\zeta)} \restriction G_{k+1} = e_{G_{k+1}}$ which holds by clause (α) above. $\square_{5.13}$

5.14 Definition. For $\eta \in T_\omega$ we have $f_\eta \in G_\omega$ is well defined as the inverse limit of $\langle f_{\eta\restriction n} \restriction G_n : n < \omega\rangle$, so $n < \omega \rightarrow f_\eta \restriction G_n = f_{\eta\restriction n}$. Follows by 5.13 and G^ω being an inverse limit.

5.15 Proposition. Let $\eta, \nu \in T_\omega$ be such that $(\forall^\infty n)(\eta(n) \neq \nu(n)), \eta(n) > 0, \nu(n) > 0$. If $t \in \mathbf{I}$, then $f_\eta f_\nu^{-1} \notin \sigma^t_\omega(H^t_\omega)$.

Proof. Suppose toward contradiction that for some $g \in H^t_\omega$ we have $\sigma^t_\omega(g) = f_\eta f_\nu^{-1}$. Let $k < \omega$ be large enough such that $t \in \mathbf{J}_k, (\forall \ell)[k \leq \ell < \omega \rightarrow \eta(\ell) \neq \nu(\ell)]$. Let $\xi^\ell = \mathrm{rk}_t(g \restriction H^t_{k_t(\ell)}, f_{\eta\restriction(\ell+1)} f^{-1}_{\nu\restriction(\ell+1)})$ and $\zeta^\ell = \mathrm{rk}_t(g \restriction H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}, f_{\eta\restriction(\ell+1)} f^{-1}_{\nu\restriction(\ell+1)})$ (the difference between the two is the use of $k_t(\ell)$ via $k_t(\ell+1)$). Clearly

$$(*)_1 \quad f_{\eta\restriction(\ell+1)} f^{-1}_{\nu\restriction(\ell+1)} = (f_{\ell,2\eta(\ell)+1} f^{-1}_{\ell,2\eta(\ell)})(f_{\eta\restriction\ell} f^{-1}_{\nu\restriction\ell}) f_{\ell,2\nu(\ell)} f^{-1}_{\ell,2\nu(\ell)+1}$$

[Why? Algebraic computations.] Next we claim that

$(*)_2$ $\xi^\ell < \infty$ for $\ell \geq k$ $(\ell < \omega)$.

Why?
Case 1: $\eta(\ell) < \nu(\ell)$.

Assume toward contradiction $\xi^\ell = \infty$, but by clause (γ) above $\mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(\ell)}}, f_{\ell,2\eta(\ell)+2} f^{-1}_{\ell,2\eta(\ell)+1}) < \infty = \xi^\ell$, hence by 5.8(3).

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{rk}_t(g \restriction H^t_{k_t(\ell)}, f_{\ell,2\eta(\ell)+2} f^{-1}_{\ell,2\eta(\ell)+1} f_{\eta\restriction(\ell+1)} f^{-1}_{\nu\restriction(\ell+1)}) = \ &\mathrm{Min}\{\mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(\ell)}}, f_{\ell,2(\eta(\ell)+2} f^{-1}_{\ell,2\eta(\ell)+1}),\\ &\mathrm{rk}_t(g \restriction H^t_{k_t(\ell)}, f_{\eta\restriction(\ell+1)} f^{-1}_{\nu\restriction(\ell+1)})\} =\\ &\mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(\ell)}}, f_{\ell,2\eta(\ell)+2} f^{-1}_{\ell,2\eta(\ell)+1}) < \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Now (by the choice of $f_{\eta\restriction(\ell+1)}, f_{\nu\restriction(\ell+1)}$, algebraic computation and the previous inequality) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\infty > \ &\mathrm{rk}_t(g \restriction H^t_{k_t(\ell)}, f_{\ell,2\eta(\ell)+2} f^{-1}_{\ell,2\eta(\ell)+1} f_{\eta\restriction(\ell+1)} f^{-1}_{\nu\restriction(\ell+1)}) =\\ &\qquad \mathrm{rk}_t(g \restriction H^t_\ell, (f_{\ell,2\eta(\ell)+2} f^{-1}_{\ell,2\eta(\ell)})(f_{\eta\restriction\ell} f^{-1}_{\nu\restriction\ell})(f_{\ell,2\nu(\ell)} f^{-1}_{\ell,2\nu(\ell)+1})).\end{aligned}$$

This and the assumption $\xi_\ell = \infty$ gives a contradiction to $(\delta)(i)$ of 5.10 (for (i_0, i_1, i_2, i_3) being $(2\eta(\ell), 2\eta(\ell)+2, 2\nu(\ell), 2\nu(\ell)+1)$ and being $(2\eta(\ell), 2\eta(\ell)+1, 2\nu(\ell), 2\nu(\ell)+1)$.

Case 2: $\nu(\ell) > \eta(\ell)$.

Similar using $(\delta)(ii)$ of 5.10 instead of $(\delta)(i)$ of 5.10 (using $\eta(\ell) > 0$).
So we have proved $(*)_2$.

$(*)_3$ $\xi^{\ell+1} \le \zeta^\ell$ for $\ell > k$.

Why? Assume toward contradiction $\xi^{\ell+1} > \zeta^\ell$.
Let $f^* = f_{\eta\restriction(\ell+1)} f^{-1}_{\nu\restriction(\ell+1)}$, so $\zeta^\ell = \mathrm{rk}_t(g \restriction H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}, f^*)$ and using the choie of $\xi^{\ell+1}$ and $(*)_1$ we have $\xi^{\ell+1} = \mathrm{rk}_t(g \restriction H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}, f_{(\ell+1),2\eta(\ell+1)+1} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)} f^* f_{\ell+1,2\nu(\ell+1)} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\nu(\ell+1)+1})$.

If $\zeta^\ell < \mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}}, f_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)+1} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)})$ then by 5.10$(\delta)(iii)$ also $\zeta^\ell < \mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}}, f_{\ell+1,2\nu(\ell+1)+1} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\nu(\ell+1)})$ hence using twice 5.8(2) we have first $\zeta^\ell = \mathrm{rk}_t(g \restriction H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}, f_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)+1} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)} f^*)$ and second (using also 5.7(2)) $\zeta^\ell = \mathrm{rk}_t(g \restriction H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}, f_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)+1} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)} f^* f_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)+1})$, so by the second statement in the previous paragraph we get $\zeta_\ell = \xi^{\ell+1}$ contradicting our temporary assumption toward contradiction.

Also if $\mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}}, f_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)+1} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)}) \ne \mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}}, f_{\ell+1,2\nu(\ell+1)+1} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\nu(\ell+1)}$ then by 5.10$(\delta)(iii)+(iv)$ also ζ^ℓ is not equal to those two ordinals so similarly to the previous sentence, 5.8(2) gives $\xi^{\ell+1} = \mathrm{Min}\{\mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}}, f_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)+1} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)}),$

$\mathrm{rk}_t(g \restriction H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}, f^*), \mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}}, f_{\ell+1,2\nu(\ell+1)+1} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\nu(\ell+1)})\}$ which is $\le \zeta^\ell$ so $\xi^{\ell+1} = \zeta^\ell$, contradicting our assumption toward contradiction.

Together the case left is (remember 5.7)

- $\boxtimes$ $\zeta^\ell = \mathrm{rk}_t(g \restriction H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}, f^*) \geq \mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}}, f_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)+1} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)}) = \mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}}, f_{\ell+1,2\nu(\ell+1)+1} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\nu(\ell+1)})$.

So in 5.10(ε), for $n = \ell + 1$, case (b) holds.
As, toward contradiction we are assuming $\xi^{\ell+1} > \zeta^\ell$ in the proof of $(*)_3$ we get, by 5.8 e.g. if $\eta(\ell + 1) > \nu(\ell + 1)$ that
$\mathrm{rk}_t(g \restriction H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}, f_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)+2} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)} f_{\eta\restriction(\ell+1)} f^{-1}_{\nu\restriction(\ell+1)} f_{\ell+1,2\nu(\ell+1)} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\nu(\ell+1)+1}) =$
$\mathrm{rk}_t(e_{H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}}, f_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)+2} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)})$ but by (b) of 5.10(ε) proved above the later is $\leq \zeta^\ell < \xi^{\ell+1} = \mathrm{rk}_t(g \restriction H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}, f_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell+1)+1} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\eta(\ell)} f_{\eta\restriction(\ell+1)} f^{-1}_{\nu\restriction(\ell+1)} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\nu(\ell+1)})$ contradiction to 5.10(δ)(v). If $\eta(\ell+1) < \nu(\ell+1)$ we use similarly $f_{\ell+1,2\nu(\ell+1)+2} f^{-1}_{\ell+1,2\nu(\ell+1)}$.
So $(*)_3$ holds.

- $(*)_4$ $\zeta^\ell \leq \xi^\ell$
  [Why? Look at their definitions, as $g \restriction H^t_{k_t(\ell+1)}$ is above $g \restriction H^t_{k_t(\ell)}$. Now if $k_t(\ell), k_t(\ell + 1)$ are equal trivial otherwise use 5.6(3).]
- $(*)_5$ if $k_t(\ell + 1) > k_t(\ell)$ then $\zeta^\ell < \xi^\ell$ (so $\xi^\ell > 0$)
  [Why? Like $(*)_4$.]
- $(*)_6$ $\xi^\ell \geq \xi^{\ell+1}$ and if $k_t(\ell + 1) > k_t(\ell)$ then $\xi^\ell > \xi^{\ell+1}$
  [Why? By $(*)_3 + (*)_4$ the first phrase, and $(*)_3 + (*)_5$ for the second phrase.]

So $\langle \xi^\ell : \ell \in [k, \omega) \rangle$ is non-increasing, and not eventually constant, contradiction.
$\square_{5.15}$

Proof of 5.9. Obvious as we can find $T' \subseteq T$, a subtree with $\lambda^{\aleph_0}$ ω-branches and $\eta \neq \nu \in \lim(T') \Rightarrow (\forall^\infty \ell)\eta(\ell) \neq \nu(\ell)$ and $\eta \in \lim(T')$ & $n < \omega \Rightarrow \eta(n) > 0$.
Now $\langle f_\eta : \eta \in \lim(T') \rangle$ is as required.

5.16 Conclusion: If $\mathscr{A}$ is a $(\lambda, \mathbf{I})$-system, and λ is a strong limit of cofinality $\aleph_0$ and $\mathrm{nu}(\mathscr{A}) \geq \lambda$, then $\mathrm{nu}(\mathscr{A}) =^+ 2^\lambda$.

Proof. If $\lambda = \aleph_0$ by 1.1, if $\lambda > \aleph_0$ then $\lambda > 2^{\aleph_0}$. We apply 5.2(2) to $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mu = \lambda$ (so $\mathrm{cf}(\mu) = \aleph_0$) and get $\mathscr{B}$, for which by 5.8 we have $\mathrm{nu}(\mathscr{B}) = 2^\lambda$ hence by the choice of $\mathscr{B}$ also $\mathrm{nu}(\mathscr{B}) =^+ 2^\lambda$. $\square_{5.16}$

REFERENCES.

[EkSh 505] Paul C. Eklof and Saharon Shelah. A Combinatorial Principle Equivalent to the Existence of Non-free Whitehead Groups. In *Abelian group theory and related topics*, volume 171 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 79–98. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1994. edited by R. Goebel, P. Hill and W. Liebert, Oberwolfach proceedings.

[GiSh 597] Moti Gitik and Saharon Shelah. On densities of box products. *Topology and its Applications*, **accepted**.

[GrSh 302a] Rami Grossberg and Saharon Shelah. On cardinalities in quotients of inverse limits of groups. *Mathematica Japonica*, **47**(2), 1998.

[MRSh 314] Alan H. Mekler, Andrzej Rosłanowski, and Saharon Shelah. On the p-rank of Ext. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **submitted**.

[MkSh 418] Alan H. Mekler and Saharon Shelah. Every coseparable group may be free. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **81**:161–178, 1993.

[Sh 273] Saharon Shelah. Can the fundamental (homotopy) group of a space be the rationals? *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, **103**:627–632, 1988.

[Sh:f] Saharon Shelah. *Proper and improper forcing*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer, 1998.